DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 362 SP 030 680

AUTHOR Zerr, Rita G.
TITLE What Supervisors of Student Teaching and Student Teachers Tell Us about Student Teaching.
PUB DATE 20 Feb 88
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (New Orleans, LA, February 17-20, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Anxiety; *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *State Standards; *Student Teacher Attitudes; *Student Teachers; Student Teaching; *Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

As we look for direction in improving teacher education, we should examine what research is telling us about the student teaching experience. This paper addresses the following areas: (1) a survey of literature documenting the critical role of student teaching and the cooperating teacher in teacher preparation and reporting related research on anxiety and the problems of student teachers; (2) a report on anxieties of prospective cooperating teachers; (3) a study of what student teachers have said about their cooperating teachers; (4) a national survey of supervisor of student teaching state endorsement requirements; and (5) recommendations for future research and suggested selected activities for consideration in "Supervision of Student Teaching" and "Student Teaching" courses. (Author)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED300362

# What Supervisors of Student Teaching and Student Teachers Tell Us about Student Teaching

Rita G. Zerr

Tulane University

Department of Education

Paper Presented at the American Association of
Colleges for Teacher Education
New Orleans, Louisiana
February 20, 1988

SP030680

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R.G. Zerr

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

## What Supervisors of Student Teaching and Student Teachers Tell Us about Student Teaching

As we look for direction in improving teacher education, we should examine what research is telling us about the student teaching experience. This paper addresses the following areas: (1) a survey of literature documenting the critical role of student teaching and the cooperating teacher in teacher preparation and reporting related research on anxiety and the problems of student teachers, (2) a report on anxieties of prospective cooperating teachers, (3) a study of what student teachers have said about their cooperating teachers, (4) a national survey of Supervisor of Student Teaching State endorsement requirements, and (5) recommendations for future research and suggested selected activities for consideration in "Supervision of Student Teaching" and "Student Teaching" courses.

## What Supervisors of Student Teaching and Student Teachers Tell Us about Student Teaching

As we look for direction in improving teacher education, we should examine what research tells us about the student teaching experience. Studies indicate (1) that student teaching is singularly the most significant factor in teacher preparation (Davis and Davis, 1979; Diamonti, 1977; Pecker and Tucker, 1973), (2) that the supervising teacher (i.e., cooperating teacher/critic teacher) is the student teacher's "significant other" (Cruickshank, D. and Kennedy, J. 1977; Karmos and Jacko, 1977), and (3) that anxiety is a major contributing factor in problems encountered by student teachers (Coates and Thorenson, 1976; Doherty, 1980).

Indeed, not only is the cooperating teacher of paramount importance during the teacher preparation period, but a recent study reports that when school administrators examine credentials of teacher applicants, recommendations from the cooperating teacher exert the greatest influence in teacher selection (Jacko and Karmos, 1987). Further, Guerrieri (1976) reports that the student teacher spends more time with the cooperating teacher than with any other college instructor and that, assuming that the student teacher program is based on the typical semester system, the program will compose approximately 12% of the student teacher's collegiate career. Because of the pivotal role of the cooperating teacher in both teacher preparation and job placement, it is imperative that we (1) demand that supervising teachers are specifically prepared and earn endorsement for this position and

(2) that preparation for this endorsement reflect research findings--particularly those related to what cooperating teachers and student teachers are saying.

This paper will address the following areas:

1. a survey of literature documenting the critical role of student teaching and the cooperating teacher in teacher preparation and reporting related research on anxiety and the problems of student teachers,
2. a report on anxieties of prospective cooperating teachers,
3. a study of what student teachers said about cooperating teachers,
4. a national survey of Supervisor of Student Teaching (Cooperating Teacher/Critic Teacher) State endorsement requirements, and
5. recommendations for future research and suggested topics for consideration in "Supervision of Student Teaching" courses.

## Review of Related Literature

In addition to the above literature documenting the importance of student teaching experience and the cooperating teacher (e.g., Adams, 1967; Cruickshank and Kennedy, 1977; Davis and Davis, 1979; Diamonti, 1977; Guerrierri, 1976; Jacko and Karmos, 1987; Karmos and Jacko, 1977; Peck and Tucker, 1973), studies reveal that (1) success in student teaching is most contingent upon the relationship between student teacher and cooperating teacher (Campbell and Williamson, 1973) and (2) that

"not only were cooperating teachers perceived as having the most influence on student teachers, but their influence was perceived to be more in personal support and role development than in skill development" (Karmos and Jacko, 1977, p. 54).

A twenty-year review of literature related to the issue of student teacher's anxieties and the relationship between student teacher and cooperating teacher in the student teaching process reveals that almost half of the citations (113 of 234) treated some aspect of student teacher anxiety. In general, studies clustered into the following categories:

1. recognition of the significant influence of student teachers' anxieties on success in student teaching--often manifested in publication of guidelines and anxiety scales (e.g., Coates and Thorenson, 1976; McAuley, 1960; Parsons, 1973),
2. recognition of the significant role of cooperating teachers in affecting/reducing anxieties in student teachers (e.g., Yee, 1969; Karmos and Jacko, 1977), and
3. analyses of changes in student teachers' anxieties during the student teaching experience (e.g., Campbell, 1976; Corrigan and Griswold (1963); Dutton, 1962).

While guidelines and anxiety scales have emerged from various states (e.g., Oklahoma, California, Texas), analysis of these materials show an absence of (1) a comparison of student teachers' social and personal characteristics with anxieties among the various student teaching areas of concentration and (2) provision of appropriate scales and guidelines specifically constructed for

each area of concentration. My survey of literature found little systematic knowledge on individual anxiety differences among teachers at different grade levels. Indeed, in their individual studies, Charters (1963) and Peck and Tucker (1973) also reported the same finding. Concerned with this lack, Karmos and Jacko (1979) pointed out that many would agree that the parameters of teaching in an elementary classroom are different than those in a high school placement.

Further, the related research on anxiety and problems encountered by student teachers indicates (1) that anxiety is a major contributing factor to problems encountered by student teachers (Coates and Thorenson, 1976; Doherty, 1980); (2) that anxiety found in student teachers and contributing to student teaching problems is largely attributed to personal attitudes or characteristics of student teachers prior to the beginning of student teaching (Parkay, 1980); (3) that, in a comprehensive review of 1951-74 teacher anxiety studies, anxiety appears to occur with considerable frequency and is an important concern among beginning teachers, including student teachers (Coates and Thorenson, 1976); and (4) that special supervisory training for cooperating teachers resulted in significant improvements in professional attitudes on the part of student teachers (Coates and Thorenson, 1976).

A study not specifically related to student teachers but one which is noteworthy in the investigation on anxieties is that of Milgram and Milgram (1976). This investigation revealed that an analysis of "self-concept" of teachers at different grade levels

showed that the extent of positive self-concept in teachers ranked in decreasing order as follows: secondary, elementary, early childhood, pre-school, special education. This finding may have direct implications on the anxieties of student teachers working at the various educational levels.

The belief that student teachers have numerous anxieties is well-documented (Cruickshank and Kennedy, 1977). In addition, these anxieties are accompanied by numerous student teaching problems. A study of Campbell and Williamson (1973) analyzing what student teachers perceive as areas of difficulty revealed that a large number of the problems stated dealt with their relationships with their cooperating teachers. The investigators found that, in general, these problems were "problems in human relations precipitated by lack of understanding and flexibility by both parties" (p. 169).

Doebler and Roberson (1987) found that when university faculty supervisors identified thirty teaching problems noting the frequency from checklists, the problems were grouped into three major categories: instructional behaviors, personal characteristics, and classroom management/discipline. Almost half of the problems identified by university sueprvisors were in the area of instructional behaviors and about one-fourth in personal characteristics. This is in contrast with past studies showing that perceived problems by student teachers tend to focus on classroom management and discipline. Doebler and Roberson hypothesized that supervisors tend to focus less on behaviors of the students and more on behaviors and characteristics of the

student teachers.

Hart (1987) constructed and implemented the "Student Teacher Anxiety Scale" and examined the relationship between four factors (i.e., evaluation anxiety, pupil and professional concerns anxiety, class control anxiety, and teching practice requirements anxiety) and pupil disruption. The research showed that evaluation anxiety and class control anxiety had significant positive correlations with pupil disruption, that teaching practice requirements anxiety had a marginal relationship, and pupil and professional anxiety concerns had no significant correlation with pupil disruption.

A Report on Anxieties of Prospective Cooperating Teachers

In addition to being sensitive to concerns of student teachers, we should consider those of the "significant other." Over a five-year period, fifty-three prospective cooperating teachers enrolled in my course, "Supervision of Student Teaching." This course fulfills a requirement for Supervision of Student Teaching endorsement in the State of Louisiana. At the initiation of each course (offered once per academic year), each teacher submitted a list of personal anxieties related to the supervision of student teaching. Analysis of these anxieties revealed clusters of perceived anxieties as follows: (1) modeling for student teacher, (2) preparation for meeting needs of student teacher and cooperating teacher, (3) developing positive interpersonal relationships between cooperating teacher and student teacher, (5) development of objectives, (6) implementation of assessment measures, and (7) execution of requirements/

expectations of college/university.

With each course offering, specific anxieties of the individual cooperating teacher population formed focal points of concentration. It is urgent that anxieties of cooperating teachers be addressed in courses/programs for individuals planning to supervise the most significant factor in teacher preparation.

## Report on What Student Teachers Said about Cooperating Teachers

Over a five-year period, in our Department, McConnell (1960) collected responses of students on two areas related to their cooperating teachers; i.e., "How Supervising Teachers Helped Us" and "We Wish They Had." The Pattern for "How Supervising Teachers Helped Us" included six categories: (1) personal influence of supervisors and their relations with students, (2) aid and encouragement with initial planning and teaching, (3) initiation into teaching, (4) help in assuming additional responsibility for class, (5) suggestions for imnproving plans, sources of materials, etc., and (6) guidance with child study, classroom management, professional growth.

The pattern for "We Wish They Had" included four areas: (1) more conferences--more specific suggestions, (2) need for security--defining role of student teacher, duties and responsibilities, (3) guidance in child study--classroom management, teaching, and (4) desire for more responsibility and opportunity for initiative.

The findings showed supervising teachers (1) how the students reacted to their specific actions and (2) areas in which there was

a desire for more concrete definite activities and for greater freedom to assume initiative and responsibility. The study indicated that

> "student teachers need and appreciate suggestions for improvement in many areas; want opportunities to show initiative and assume responsibility after a sense of security has been established by good personal relations with the supervising teacher and by a definition of what is expected of them; [and] realize the need for having access to detailed information about their pupils and for having the actual experience of making reports, keeping records, and becoming acquainted with the total school personnel" (p. 86).

## A National Survey of Supervisor of Student Teaching State Requirements

Because of the critical role of the classroom supervisor of student teaching in teacher preparation, this investigator conducted a national survey to analyze the State requirements for cooperating teachers. Items specifically addressed were requirements reflecting (1) certification in teaching area, (2) supervision in student teaching course, (3) years of experience, (4) degree(s), (5) other requirements, and (6) change in State requirements for cooperating teachers during the period 1982-87. A 100% response from the fifty states in presented in Table 1.

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

Analysis of Table 1 reveals the following:

1. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents (29 of 50) indicated that certification in the teaching field as required.

2. Sixteen percent (8 of 50) of the respondents (i.e., Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, North Carolina, North

Dakota, South Carolina, and Wyoming) reported that cooperating teachers complete either the course "Supervision of Student Teaching" or a comparable listing. However, analysis of the responses showed that actually only 9% (4 states) required a specific course designed for cooperating teachers--with Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, and North Dakota specifying "Supervision of Student Teaching" and Georgia supplying two additional alternatives (i.e., "The Supervising Teacher" and "Internship in Student Teaching"). Further examination of the responses revealed (a) that both Connecticut and North Carolina reported State programs (i.e., a "20-hour State-run Program for cooperating teachers" and "State workshops on performance evaluation," respectively) and Mississippi reported that cooperating teachers must be trained and pass as provisional teacher evaluators; (b) that the North Carolina State workshop on performance evaluation may be taught either as a course for credit by institutions of higher education or by Regional Center State personnel or trained school system personnel; (c) that South Carolina cooperating teachers complete a three-day reliability training program for observers and a required supervision course (not necessarily addressing student teachers); (d) and that Wyoming, although not responding as requiring a course, encourages but does not require the course "Supervision of Field Experiences."

3. Thirty-four percent of the respondents (17 of 50) reported specific teaching experience requirements ranging from 2 to 3-5 years, with 76% of these states (13 of 17) including a requirement of three years. It should be noted that although

Illinois, Utah, and Washington entered specified years of teaching experience, these states indicated that their responses were recommendations. In addition, Oregon mandates that their practicum site personnel "shall have three years of successful experience immediately prior to the practicum," and Ohio requires that one of the required three years of teaching experience must be "in the field for which the service is provided." Not included among the 17 states reporting required experience is West Virginia. While this state does not specify a teaching experience requirement mandated at the Department of Education level, West Virginia universities implement the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards in their student teaching programs and require 3 years teaching experience as part of these standards.

4. Fifty-four percent of the respondents (27 of 50) reported degree requisites, with all except three states (i.e., Louisiana, Utah, and Washington) specifying only baccalaureate degrees and Washington specifically recognizing exceptions. However, it should be noted that of the 23 respondents not reporting a degree requirement on the same questionnaire six states (i.e., Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, New York, and Ohio) indicated a requisite of "certification in the teaching area." In every case, initial certification in these states included a baccalaureate degree. Further, it should be recognized that (a) because all states include a baccalaureate degree for initial certification, interpretation of "no degree requirement" should be placed in perspective with initial certification requisites and (b) some

responding states (e.g., Maryland) may have interpreted the survey item on degree requirement literally as a State "stated" degree mandate for cooperating teachers.

5. Forty-six percent of the respondents (23 of 50) reported "other requirements" in addition to the above items. Individual State requirements listed in Table 2 include (a) placing the responsibility of selection of cooperating teachers on the supervising college/cooperating school/building administrator (i.e., Arizona, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, and North Dakota); (b) qualifying that the institutions of higher education be directed by standards of NCATE (i.e., West Virginia) or of National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) (i.e., Rhode Island), or by specific guidelines adopted by the Board of Education (i.e., Vermont); (c) requiring that cooperating teachers hold specific types of certificates requiring successful teaching experience/additional college credits/graduate degree (i.e., Connecticut--Standard Certificate, Hawaii--Professional Teacher Certificate, Louisiana--Supervisor of Student Teaching Endorsement, North Carolina--Mentor Certification, Texas--Provisional Supervisory Certificate, Utah--Administrative Supervisory Certificate, and Washington--Continuing Certificate), (d) requiring participation in State training programs (i.e., Connecfticut, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina--where North Carolina cooperating teachers may receive this training through universities for college credits), (e) specifying the level/area of teaching experience or identifying the period when the teaching experience must have been

completed (i.e., Ohio--"a minimum of three years of classroom teaching experience including one year in the field for which the service is provided" and Oregon--three years "immediately prior" to the supervision), (f) describing the attribute expectations of the cooperating teacher (i.e., Alabama and Wyoming), or (g) merely stating that the teacher must be certified (i.e., Montana--where certification in the teaching area is not required).

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

6. Sixteen percent of the respondents (8 of 50) reported changes within the last five-year period (i.e., Connecticut, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia). Table 3 presents these changes.

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

Inspection of Table 3 shows that the comments address: provision for training and stipends for cooperating teachers (i.e., Connecticut); passing of a Clinical Faculty Programs Bill, requiring that cooperating teachers "attend graduate training programs offered by public institutions of higher education" and that teachers accepted as clinical faculty members "be designated adjunct faculty" with funding anticipated for 1988 implementation (i.e., Virginia); formalization of required teaching experience (i.e., Oregon); evaluation of specific skills (i.e., Pennsylvania); training for and "passing" as Provisional Teacher Evaluator (i.e., Mississippi); adoption of area of Mentor

Certification for supervision of beginning teachers and student teachers in lieu of Supervision of Student Teaching endorsement by State board Policy (i.e., North Carolina); and moving from institutional requirements to statewide requirements for cooperating teachers (i.e., South Carolina), while, conversely, moving from State licensure to institutional control of requirements based on NCATE standards (i.e., West Virginia). It should be noted that although the Georgia Data Collection Training program is no longer a required program for cooperating teachers, but a recommended program, it is coming up for review as a requirement.

Summary

Analysis of this survey of cooperating teacher requirements indicates that of the 50 states (1) twenty-nine states report a requisite of certification in the teaching field; (2) only four states (i.e., Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, North Dakota) require a course specifically designed for cooperating teachers; two states (i.e., North Carolina and Connecticut) recorded state course requirements which are state programs--the North Carolina program, however, may be taught for university credit by university faculty; and one state (i.e., Wyoming) recommends but does not require a specific course for cooperating teachers; (3) four states (i.e., Connecticut, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina) require training/evaluation of cooperating teachers in State Programs, with Georgia recommending its Data Collection Training Program; (4) ten states require three years of teaching experience; four states require two years of experience; and three

states recommend three years of experience; (5) only two states require a graduate degree (i.e., Louisiana and Utah); and (6) two states (i.e., Rhode Island and West Virginia) report that institutions of higher education establish the requirements, using NASDTEC and NCATE standards, respectively--however, it should be noted that all 50 states are members of NASDTEC; (7) one state (i.e., Vermont) requires that its institutions follow specific State guidelines of its institutional expectations; (8) seven states (i.e., Connecticut, Hawaii, Louisiana, North Carolina, Texas, Utah, and Washington) require that cooperating teachers hold specific types of certificates; and (9) nine states (i.e., Connecticut, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia) report changes within the last five years.

Implications

Based on survey responses from the fifty states, the following implications deserve consideration:

1. West Virginia's stance on institutional requirements based on NCATE standards for cooperating teachers instead of State licensure may portend similar postures among other states.

2. Oregon's formalization of three years of teaching experience as a requirement for cooperating teachers and the fact that better than one-third of the states reported a requirement of 2-3 years of teaching experience indicate a recognition of the need for experienced teachers to serve as models and mentors.

3. Evaluation of specific cooperating teacher skills/ implementation of State programs (e.g., Connecticut, Mississippi,

North Carolina, and South Carolina) reflect recognition by State Departments of Education of the necessity for identifying highly skilled supervisory teachers.

4. With five states (Connecticut, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina) providing leadership in state training programs for cooperating teachers and 4 of 5 mandating the training and having programs initially implemented within the last five years, it appears that some states are realizing the importance and benefits of having trained personnel prepare future teachers and are taking the responsibility of training their own cooperating teachers.

However, this report on the national survey of the status of the preparation of the "significant other" in teacher education demonstrates a lack of preparation and standards expectation in the majority of our states for individuals who are critical in teacher preparation.

## Recommendations

Attention must be focused not only on the preparation of cooperating techers but also on a requirement of teaching experience before empowering individuals with the authority and accompanying responsibilities to provide and supervise student teaching experiences. In keeping with national recommendations (e.g., Holmes and Carnegie Reports) to upgrade techer education, serious consideration must be given to the preparation of cooperating teachers in terms of advanced degrees. Further, cooperating teachers should be allowed to supervise in fields only where they themselves are certified and have had experience. And

finally, the required preparation should include a course or State training program specifically designed for prospective cooperating teachers.

This course/program should include: classroom observation techniques; data collection strategies; evaluation techniques, specifically addressing teaching competencies; knowledge of what research has to say about interpersonal, personal, and teaching skills of good teachers and about student teaching; preparation for developing positive interpersonal, personal, and teaching skills in teacher candidates; and, as a proactive measure, knowledge of the legal aspects of cooperating teachers and student teachers. In addition, cooperating teachers must be versed in university expectations of their student teachers, their cooperating teachers, and their university supervisors. It is critical that cooperating teachers participate in a comprehensive preparatory program before assuming their awesome responsibilities as supervisors of student teachers.

Future research should continually update the survey of State requirements of cooperating teachers to keep educators attuned to changes and innovative programs. In this study, all but 19 states specifically commented on whether or not an endorsement/ certification was required under the item "Other Requirements." In most instances, an absence of a comment under this item, supported by negative responses to other items in the questionnaire, gave clear indication that neither certification nor endorsement was required; and the absence of the statement was interpreted as a negative response. However, a follow-up report

will be conducted on the 19 states, and results will be forthcoming.

In addition, other research should address the area of student teacher anxieties. Studies delineating interfacing and unique anxieties descriptive of the various categories followed by construction of student teacher anxiety scales appropriate to each of the teaching levels/areas and field testing are needed. Implementation of student teacher anxiety scales can serve as an invaluable means of reducing anxieties and alleviating some of the accompanying problems during this critical period in teacher preparation.

## References

Adams, R. (1967). The application of a special approach to teacher selection and appraisal. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 039 183).

Beauchamp, L. (1983). Cooperating and student teacher expectations: Beefs and Bouquets. The Teacher Educator, 2-6.

Boschee, F., Prescott, D., & Hein, D. (1978). Do cooperating teachers influence the educational philosophy of student teachers? Journal of Teacher Education, 20(2), 57-61.

Campbell, D. (1967, December). Dimensional attitude changes of student teachers. The Journal of Teacher Research, 61(4), 160-162.

Campbell, L. P, & Williamson, J. A. (1963, November). Practical problems in the student teacher cooperative teacher relationship. Education, 94, 168-169.

Charters, W. W., Jr. (1963). The social background of teaching. In Nathan L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, 715-813. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Coates, T., & Thorenson, C. (1976, Spring). Teacher anxiety: A review with recommendations. Review of Educational Research, 46(2), 159-184.

Cruickshank, D., & Kennedy, J. (1977, September-October). The role of significant others during the student teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 51-55.

Davis, M., & Davis, C. (1977). Studying student teachers' acceptance of role responsibility. Education, 101(2), 188-192.

Diamonti, M. C. (1977), May). Student teacher supervision. Education Forum, 41(4), 477-486.

Doebler, L. K., & Roberson, T. G. (1987). A study of common problems experienced by secondary student teachers. Education, 107, 234-243.

Doherty, J. (1980, February). An exploratory investigation into the relationship between self-esteem and teaching performance in a group of student teachers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 229 337).

Dutton, W. (1980, May). Attitude change of elementary school student teachers and anxiety. The Journal of Educational Research, 55(8), 380-382.

Guerrieri, D. (1976, April). Student teaching: A team concept. The Balance Sheet, 57, 300-302, 332.

Hart, Norah I. (1987, February). Student teacher's anxieties: Four measured factors & their relationship. Educational Research, 29(19), 12-18.

Jacko, C., & Karmos, A. (1987, February). The relationship between stress and success in student teaching. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association of Teacher Education, Houston, TX.

Karmos, A., & Jacko, C. (1977, September-October). The role of significant other during the student teaching experience. Research in Teaching Education, 28(5), 51-55.

McConnell, G. (1960, March). They helped us, but--. The Journal of Teacher Education, 11(1), 84-86.

McAulay, J. D. (1960, March). How much influence has a cooperating teacher? Journal of Teacher Education, 11(1), 79-83.

Milgram, T., & Milgram, N. (1976, October). Self-concept differences in student teachers in primary, elementary, secondary, and special education. Psychology in the Schools, 12(4), 439-441.

Parkay, Forrest W. (1980, February). Emerging professional identities: Attitude changes of secondary education student teachers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 183 522).

Parsons, J. (1973). Assessment of anxiety about teaching using the teaching anxiety scale: Manual and research report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 079 330).

Peck, R. F., & Tucker, A. (1973). Research on teacher education. In R.M.W Travers (Ed.), Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Yee, A. (1969). Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? Journal of Educational Psychology. 60(4), 327-332.

## TABLE 1

### REPORT ON 1987-88 STATE REQUIREMENTS FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS

| NAME OF STATE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | | | 3 | | * | |
| Alaska | | | | | | |
| Arizona | * | | | * | * | |
| Arkansas | | | | | | |
| California | | | | | | |
| Colorado | | | | | | |
| Connecticut | * | ** | 3 | * | * | * |
| Delaware (telecom.) | * | | | | | |
| Florida | * | | | | | |
| Georgia | * | * | 2 | * | *(rec.) | |
| Hawaii | * | * | 3 | | * | |
| Idaho | * | | | * | | |
| Illinois | * | | 3-5(rec.) | | | |
| Indiana | | | | | | |
| Iowa | | | | | | |
| Kansas (telecom.) | * | | | * | * | |
| Kentucky | | | | | | |
| Louisiana | * | * | 3 | ** | * | |
| Maine | | | | | | |
| Maryland | | | | | | |
| Massachusetts | | | | | | |
| Michigan | * | | | * | | |
| Minnesota | | | | | | |
| Mississippi | * | | | * | * | * |
| Missouri | | | | | | |
| Montana | | | | * | * | |
| Nebraska | * | | | * | * | |
| Nevada (telecom.) | * | | | * | | |
| New Hampshire | | | | | | |
| New Jersey | | | | * | | |
| New Mexico (telecom.) | | | | * | * | |
| New York | * | | | | | |
| North Carolina | * | ** | | * | * | * |
| North Dakota | * | * | 2 | * | * | |
| Ohio | * | | 3 | | * | |
| Oklahoma | | | | | | |
| Oregon | * | | 3 | * | | * |
| Pennsylvania (telecom.) | * | | | * | * | * |
| Rhode Island (telecom.) | * | | | * | * | * |
| South Carolina | * | *** | 2 | * | * | * |
| South Dakota | | | | | | |
| Tennessee | | | | | | |
| Texas (telecom.) | | | 3 | * | * | |
| Utah (telecom.) | * | | 3(rec.) | ** | * | |
| Vermont | * | | 3 | * | * | |
| Virginia | * | | 3 | * | | * |
| Washington | * | | 3(rec.) | ** | * | |
| West Virginia(telecom.) | * | | | * | * | * |
| Wisconsin | * | | 2 | * | | |
| Wyoming | * | *(rec.) | 3 | * | * | |

1 = certification in teaching area
2 = supervision in student teaching course
3 = number of years of required experience
4 = required degree
5 = other requirements
6 = change in State requirements for Cooperating Teachers (1982-87)

Columns 1, 2, 5, 6

* Yes
** State program
*** Supervision course not specifically addressing teachers.

Column 4

* Baccalaureate degree
** Master's degree

**Note:** No response or N/A interpreted as negative response.

Table 2

Other State Requirements for Cooperating Teachers (1987-88)

| State | Other State Requirements |
|---|---|
| Alabama | 1. Be a highly competent teacher in the area of specialization of the intern(s) to be supervised as determined by criteria approved by the State Board of Education.<br>2. Understand the program of each intern supervised and the levels of achievement of each.<br>3. Be competent to provide superior professional supervision of interns as determined by criteria applicable to each institution and approved by the State Board of Education.<br>4. Be approved by the appropriate school superintendent and dean or director of teacher education. |
| Arizona | At the discretion of supervising, college or university and cooperating school. |
| Connecticut | 1. Must hold a standard certificate. To qualify for a standard certificate one must have three years of successful teaching and 30 credits beyond the bachelor's.<br>2. Must earn a certificate of completion of a 20 hour State-run program for cooperating teachers. Teachers receive a certificate of completion--not a supervisor of student teaching endorsement--and a Continuing Education Unit (CEU) credit, which may be used to maintain their certification. Program taught by 5 consortia--each composed of 2 colleges of universities, 1 Regional Education Center, and 1 local school district. |
| Georgia | Data Collection Training is recommended for the Supervising Teacher Srvices Program. Data Collection addresses eight (8) generic competencies evaluating the teaching skills in planning and carrying out instruction in the |

Table continues

| | |
|---|---|
| | classroom. Upon completion teachers receive Supervising Teacher Services (STS) Certification. This training and certification is recommended but not required at this time. Universities offer program for credit in a 2 or 3 course sequence program. |
| Hawaii | Professional Teacher Certificate. |
| Kansas | Must be monitored by the university. |
| Louisiana | Must hold Louisiana type "B" Certificate and Supervision of Student Teaching endorsement. |
| Mississippi | Must be trained and "pass" as provisional teacher evaluator. |
| Montana | Must be a certified teacher. |
| Nebraska | "Success" in view of building administrator. |
| New Mexico | Must fulfill individual university requirements. |
| North Carolina | Effective teacher training (State workshops on performance evaluation). Program may be taught by (1) Regional Centers' state personnel, (2) school system with trained personnel, or (3) universities (for course credit).<br><br>Teachers receive "Mentor Certification," valid for supervision of student teachers and beginning teachers. |
| North Dakota | Recommended by administration. |
| Ohio | There is a standard which requires that cooperating teachers have a minimum of 3 years experience in the field for which the service is provided. |
| Pennsylvania | All new teachers including cooperating teachers as of 6/1/87 receiving instructional certification for the first time will be required to pass the Pennsylvania Teacher Certification Testing Program. |

Table continues

| State | Other State Requirements |
|---|---|
| Rhode Island | Universities establish the requirements to meet the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) standards. Cooperating teachers are adjunct faculty and often serve on advisory panels. |
| South Carolina | 1. Completion of an institution's program for cooperating teachers defined as "a formal effort provided by the institution designed to enhance the effectiveness of the cooperating teachers."<br>2. Completion of the 3-day reliability training program for observers using the state performance assessment instrument for student teachers--Assessment of Performance in Teaching (APT).<br>3. Attendance at an orientation session (different from above item 1)--addressing policies, procedures, rules and regulations.<br>4. Annual recommendation by superintendent or his designee for service as a cooperating teacher. |
| Texas | Professional Supervisory Certification (30 hours overall). |
| Utah | An actual endorsement in supervision of student teaching is not provided. There are guidelines for the assignment of student teaching only. Cooperating teachers are expected to have Administrative Supervisory Certification on which includes fulfilling university requirements for this certification, a teaching certificate, and a M.A. degree. |
| Vermont | The placement of student teachers is the responsibility of the college and must meet the following requirement:<br>1. The placement must be with a qualified teacher in an appropriate setting. |

Table continues

| State | Other State Requirements |
|---|---|
| | 2. The college must have a written agreement with the school in which a student teacher is placed, outlining the responsibilities of each party.<br>3. The college will maintain a core of cooperating teachers and will provide them with training in the strategies and methods being taught in the teacher preparation program.<br>4. The student teaching placement process must be detailed in a student teaching handbook. |
| Washington | State Board rules require that universities provide training for supervisors. In addition, a Continuing Certificate (5th year progress completion) is required. |
| West Virginia | Counties and colleges develop criteria for the selection of cooperating public school personnel utilizing NCATE standards, which includes 3 years experience in the area in which they are working and systematic and regular faculty development provided for faculty, cooperating teachers, and others who may participate or contribute to the professional education program. |
| Wyoming | We look for the best, most creative teachers available and provide guidance and encouragement. Above all, the supervising teacher must want a student. |

Table continues

**Table 3**

**Changes in State Requirements for Cooperating Teachers 1982-87**

| State | Changes |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | We do not have a supervisor of student teaching endorsement. However, Public Act 86-1 which came out of the 1986 legislative session provided for the training of cooperating teachers and for stipends for the supervising of student teachers. The program was piloted in 1986-87 and is fully implemented for the 1987-88 year. |
| Mississippi | Cooperating Teachers must be trained as a provisional teacher evaluator. |
| North Carolina | "Mentor Certification" adopted by State Board Policy (7/1/87). This certification added new component and replaced Supervision of Student Teaching program. |
| Oregon | Three years experience formalized as rule. |
| Pennsylvania | As of June 1, 1987, a state test for all teachers receiving initial certification will be required. |
| Rhode Island | Prior to January 1987 Critic Teacher Certification required--included 2-3 years of experience and a course. Currently, the supervisors of student teaching are monitored by the universities and are adjunct faculty members. |
| South Carolina | Prior to 1986, each institution was required to develop criteria. The requirements referred to in items 2-5 of this survey [supervision of student teaching course, required experience, other requirements] are now required of all institutions. |
| Virginia | The 1987 General Assembly passed a bill relating to clinical faculty programs. It is hoped that funding for this program will be appropriated by the 1988 General Assembly. |
| West Virginia | Requirements were amended as of November 1987. State licensure is no longer required. Institutions of higher education develop criteria utilizing NCATE standards. |